



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,560	03/09/2001	Akira Tsubouchi	18733/00040	7306
24731	7590	06/04/2004	EXAMINER	
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP			JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL	
717 NORTH HARWOOD			ART UNIT	
SUITE 3400			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75201			3726	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/803,560

Applicant(s)

TSUBOUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-4 and 15-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Species A, Claim 1 in the response filed 2/6/04 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 2-4 and 15-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the response filed 2/6/04.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of **50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3726

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art [AAPA] (fig. 1-9) in view of Millard et al. (2,419,724).

[AAPA] teaches a method for manufacturing a hollow rack shaft comprising: a first step for forming a substantially flat and rectangular plate workpiece into a gutter-like shaped workpiece (fig. 1a-1c), the gutter-like shaped workpiece having a flat bottom portion **2a**, a pair of semi-circular bottom portions **1** extending from each longitudinal side of said flat bottom portion **2a**, and a pair of leg-like side walls extending upwardly in parallel from each lateral side of said flat bottom portion **2a** and the semi-circular portions **1**; a second step (fig. 3) for forming a row of rack teeth **2b** on the flat bottom portion of the gutter-shaped workpiece; and a third step (fig. 9c) for forming said workpiece into a hollow shape by bending the leg-like side walls by butting edges of said walls to each other.

[AAPA] teaches the invention cited with the exception of a pressing surface of a pair of dies used in the first step being inclined in a longitudinal direction of the workpiece relative to a pressing surface of a second pair of dies used in the first step so as to cancel elastic recovering of the workpiece when the workpiece is removed from the die set.

Milliard et al. teach a pressing surface **16** of a pair of dies being inclined (col. 2, lines 55-56) in a longitudinal direction of a workpiece **P** relative to a pressing surface of a second pair of dies **24** so as to cancel elastic recovering of the workpiece when the workpiece is removed from the die set (col. 3, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of [AAPA] with a pressing surface of a pair of dies used in the first step being inclined in a longitudinal direction of the workpiece relative to a pressing surface of a second pair of dies used in the first step so as to cancel elastic recovering of the workpiece when the workpiece is removed from the die set, in light of the teachings of Millard et al., in order to compensate for spring back of the workpiece material and therefore creating a straighter rack shaft.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. Applicant argues that Millard et al. do not teach compensating for elastic recovery in the longitudinal direction. It is noted however, that fig. 1a of applicant's admitted prior art clearly shows dies **121** that are located in the longitudinal direction of the workpiece **W**. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to create an angle on the dies **112** shown in applicant's admitted prior art in fig. 1a of applicant's specification, in view of Millard et al. who clearly compensates for spring back (col. 3, lines 1-2) which is considered "so as to cancel elastic recovering of said workpiece when said workpiece is removed from said die set" as claimed, in order to make a straighter workpiece.

8. A telephone interview was conducted on 12/17/03 with Brian E. Harris. Mr. Harris was informed that the instant case was re-assigned from a previous examiner. Examiner Jimenez informed Mr. Harris that the case had not been read and all of the references were not yet considered at the time of the interview. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims during the interview.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Interviews After Final

10. Applicant note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing) to clarify issues for appeal requiring only nominal further

Art Unit: 3726


consideration. Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations will be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number is (703) 306-5965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between 5:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Marc Jimenez
Patent Examiner
AU 3726

MJ

May 29, 2004